



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,696	12/31/2003	Lorrie A. Creveling	20655.0600	2179
66170	7590	09/22/2010	EXAMINER	
Snell & Wilmer L.L.P. (AMEX) ONE ARIZONA CENTER 400 E. VAN BUREN STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202				GREGG, MARY M
3694		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			09/22/2010	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

HSOBELMAN@SWLAW.COM
DMIER@SWLAW.COM
JESLICK@SWLAW.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/749,696	CREVELING ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MARY GREGG	3694

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Non-Final Office Action in response to communications received September 09, 2010. Claim 15 has been canceled. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 14, 20 and 22 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-14 and 15-23 are pending and addressed below.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17 (e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission has been entered.

Response to Arguments/Amendments

3. In the remarks the applicant argues (1) that the prior art "Lee" does not teach "fee is not accessed to all disputed transactions" (2) that the prior art "Lee" does not teach "fee set based on monetary value of the disputed credit transactions of the merchant that exceeds the ratio" (3) that Lee teaches away from a threshold ratios for levying fines (4) that the prior art Richey fails to suggest or teach "assessing a fee against the merchant for each disputed transaction that exceeds the threshold ratio" (5) that the combination fails to teach "assessing, using the computer-based system, a fee against the merchant for each disputed transaction involving the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio, in response to the merchant's ratio being at least equal to

the predetermined threshold ratio, wherein the fee is not assessed to all disputed transactions, wherein the fee is set based on a monetary value of each of the disputed credit transactions of the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio," as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added) and as similarly recited by independent claims 14 and 20". (6) that dependent claims 2, 6-11, 13 and 21 depend upon claims 1, 14 and 20 and are therefore allowable due to the deficiencies of the rejections as cited above with respect to arguments 1-5 (7) that the prior art combination Cannon in view of Lee and Richey and further in view of Sharper fails to teach "assessing, using the computer-based system, a fee against the merchant for each disputed transaction involving the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio, in response to the merchant's ratio being at least equal to the predetermined threshold ratio, wherein the fee is not assessed to all disputed transactions, and wherein the fee is set based on a monetary value of each of the disputed credit transactions of the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio," as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added) and as similarly recited by independent claims 14 and 20. (8) that dependent claims 3-5, 12, 16-19 and 22-23 depend from claims 1, 14 and 20 and are therefore allowable due to the deficiencies of the rejections as cited above with respect to arguments 1-5.

In response to argument (1) through (2) and (4) and (6), according to MPEP 2145 (IV), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208

Art Unit: 3694

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to argument (3) that Lee teaches away from a threshold ratios for levying fines, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The prior art Lee was cited against the limitation "assessing...a fee...for each disputed transaction", and "in response to the merchant's ratio being at least equal to the predetermined threshold ratio" which Lee teaches explicitly.

Cannon teaches in at least:

Col FIG. 14; Col 7 lines 32-67:

Referring now to FIG. 14, a WWW page 210 is displayed on client station 16 when user clicks Security/Fraud Exceptions 62 hyperlink. WWW page 210 includes the following hyperlinks to reports corresponding to the security/fraud exceptions category: **Credits Exceeding Sales Exception Report 212, Daily Average Ticket Variance (Signed Norm) 214, Daily Average Ticket Variance-2 216, Daily Credit Report 218, Daily Declined/Referred Rate 220, Daily Exception NRPT Report (DER) 222, Daily Licensed Exception NRPT 224, Daily Top Depositor 226, Keyed vs. Scanned Exception report 228, Monthly Retrieval report 230, New Account Tracking report 232, Semi Monthly Chargeback report (15th) 234, Semi Monthly Chargeback report (30th) 236, Single Cardholder Sales/Credits 238, Telemarketing Exception report 240, Weekly Multi Sales/Credit Small Cardholder 242, and Weekly Activity Client Tracking report 244.**

(48) The credits exceeding sales exception report highlights all merchants whose **dollar amount of credits on any given day exceeds the amount of sales for that day by a given amount and percentage**. Excessive credits create immediate risks and need to be investigated immediately.

Art Unit: 3694

(49) The daily average ticket variance (signed norm) report is for newly signed/depositing merchants. This **report highlights those merchants whose actual average ticket variance exceeds their signed average ticket by a predefined percentage.**

(50) The daily average ticket variance-2 provides a listing of merchants who have average ticket variances. It provides a comparison of the merchant's three month average ticket to the daily average ticket and annual signed sales to actual activity. Merchants listed should be reviewed for invalid sales, factoring, etc.

(51) **The daily credit report calculates a merchant's credit ratio (credits divided into sales) and highlights those which are considered to be excessive.**

Col 8 lines 29-39:

The monthly retrieval report identifies merchants with a large percentage of retrievals. Merchants who appear in this report are considered highly suspect as their customers appear unfamiliar with the transactions for which they are billed and need the media in order to validate the transaction.

(58) The new account tracking report is segmented into three components depending upon how long the merchant has been on the base. This report will highlight merchants whose actual sales volume for a period exceeds expectations for that period.

Lee teaches explicitly:

Para 0019:

[0019] **In addition to paying a fee for each chargeback, issuing banks can levy fines on merchants having too many chargebacks.** Typically 1.5-3.0% of the merchant's chargeback volume, such fines can range from a few hundred dollars per month, to \$10,000 or even \$100,000 per month, **with fines escalating higher as chargebacks continue unabated.**

Note that the individual fees accessed are a separate fee from the fines for merchants who exceed the range. The prior art Cannon individually also teaches that levels are set with respect to vendor chargebacks. Lee teaches levying fines to defray chargeback volumes cost. Lee does not teach away from threshold fines, but teaches explicitly that higher levels of chargebacks generate higher fines.

The examiner maintains the rejections .

In response to argument (5) that the combination fails to teach "assessing, using the computer-based system, a fee against the merchant for each disputed transaction involving the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio, in response to the merchant's ratio being at least equal to the predetermined threshold ratio, wherein the fee is not assessed to all disputed transactions, wherein the fee is set based on a monetary value of each of the disputed credit transactions of the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio," as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added) and as similarly recited by independent claims 14 and 20", The examiner respectfully disagrees.

... assessing, using the computer-based system, a fee against the merchant for each disputed transaction involving the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio (see Lee para 0019)

[0019] In addition to paying a fee for each chargeback, issuing banks can levy fines on merchants having too many chargebacks. Typically 1.5-3.0% of the merchant's chargeback volume, such fines can range

Art Unit: 3694

from a few hundred dollars per month, to \$10,000 or even \$100,000 per month, **with fines escalating higher as chargebacks continue unabated.**

Note that Lee teaches a fee for each chargeback and a fine that wherein the transactions exceed a threshold, in that "having to many chargebacks" implies a threshold in order to determine "to many"

...wherein the fee is not assessed to all disputed transactions,...

Note that "fines are only accessed for "to many", which implies if there are less than "to many" that a fine is not accessed for all disputed transactions. The Combination further teaches:

Richey teaches:

Col 6 lines 45-67; Col 7 lines 1-8:

Optionally, when returning transactions as part of the RFI response, the online dispute resolution system 10 may highlight transactions that are tied to authorization-related chargebacks that are (1) below **floor limit and was listed on the exception file; (2) in excess of the floor limit and authorizations were not obtained; and** (3) related to a present referral. Other transactions may also be highlighted if such transactions are tied to all chargeback types that (1) were previously or, are currently being disputed; and (2) relate to a credit which was previously given when there was or was not a corresponding transaction. (note threshold)

(25) **For POS check transactions returned as part of the RFI response, the online dispute resolution system 10 may also provide the following information: check number, transit routing number, transit time, POS condition code, and check settlement code. (note individual charges)**

Art Unit: 3694

(26) At 54, the issuer takes appropriate actions based on the RFI response. The issuer may perform a number of different actions. For example, the issuer may search for additional, related credit transactions. The issuer may further view transaction details relating to the original transaction as well as the additional, related transactions and query any exception file related thereto. The transactions may be viewed in the form of substitute drafts, digital receipts and case history summaries. Upon reviewing the transactions, the issuer may then initiate one or more of the following actions including (a) request for copy, (b) attempt to resolve, (c) chargeback, (d) pre-compliance and (e) good faith collection. Optionally, RFI responses are deleted at a system-wide level if no action is taken after a set number of days.

Col 10 lines 34-49; FIG. 7:

If a resolution cannot be attained in the RFI or ATR stages, the information gathered can be used to initiate a dispute with respect to the disputed transaction through the online dispute resolution system 10. The online dispute resolution system 10 provides users with a simplified process for creating chargeback and representment transactions as well as a way of providing information and/or supporting documentation. The simplification is based on seven new dispute groups and the ability of the online dispute resolution system 10 to intuitively guide the user through the underlying reason codes for each group.

(51) FIG. 7 is a table listing the various dispute groups and their underlying reason codes. The new dispute groups include (1) non-receipt of information, (2) authorization error, (3) processing error, (4) non-receipt of goods or services, (5) canceled/returned, (6) quality, and (7) fraud.

Col 16 lines 40-Col 17 lines 10:

The analyst may make one of five possible rulings including: in favor of the issuer, **in favor of the acquirer, split decision, issuer withdrawal, and**

Art Unit: 3694

acquirer withdrawal. The ruling may be one of the following, including, chargeback is not valid, chargeback past time, missing required documentation, issuer's chargebacks valid, rule violation occurred, rule violation did not occur, **committee split the decision, cardholder dispute unreasonable, cardholder dispute reasonable, no third party opinion, case withdrawn by acquirer, case withdrawn by issuer and other.**

(96) Comments are included to describe the reason for the ruling. Once a ruling has been made by the analyst, **both parties to a dispute are notified of the decision and the fees, penalties and fines levied, if any. Amounts and fees may be divided between the parties to the dispute.** The analyst has the discretion to adjust these amounts. Withdrawn cases may be charged to the withdrawing party. In one exemplary embodiment, the online dispute resolution system 10 only permits each party to see its own ruling. Parties to the dispute are responsible for notifying their respective cardholder and merchant of the ruling.

(97) Appeal

(98) The losing party to the dispute may appeal for a re-review of the case within in a specified time period and case dollar value. For example, a ruled case may be appealed within 45 days of the ruling notification date and only if the case amount is equal to or greater than a preset amount, such as, \$5000. The online dispute resolution system 10 is capable of maintaining the appeal qualification conditions, such as, the specified time period for appeal and case dollar value, for each decided case. The online dispute resolution system 10 permits a losing party to re-file either arbitration or compliance cases as an appeal. Furthermore, the online dispute resolution system 10 maintains a history of the dispute including the identity of the analyst who decides the dispute. If a ruling is appealed, the online dispute resolution system 10 is capable of automatically assigning the appealed case to the same analyst, to the extent possible, who handled the original dispute.

Col 21 lines 58-67:

Art Unit: 3694

Another category of reports that are also available to users of the online dispute resolution system 10 includes, for example, case filing and ruling reports that provide users statistical information for all their cases that are pending a ruling or are closed; arbitration, compliance and direct compliance dispute resolution summary and detail reports for closed arbitration and compliance cases reporting information, such as, percentage of withdrawals, wins, losses, rejects, and splits for issuers and acquirers, fees assessed for the cases and a comparison of system-wide performance;

Col 22 lines 25-44:

The online dispute resolution system 10 also produces reports on service usage and productivity. Service usage and productivity reports provide information to evaluate and improve operator productivity and performance. Cardholder and merchant activity is available in this set of reports and a summary of fees and charges assessed upon dispute resolution. These reports include, for example, operator and group productivity reports that provide counts for worked items (e.g. requests for copy, transactions initiated, closed, fulfilled, completed questionnaires, merchants serviced/terminated, etc.) by operator or group of operators; cardholder activity report that provides detail and summary activity by cardholder; merchant activity report that provides detail and summary activity by merchant; service fees and charges report that provides detail and summary counts and amounts for all fees and charges by dispute transaction type; and system performance report that supports system performance tuning by providing minimum, average and maximum response times for each service action.

Note that the prior art is directed toward disputes with respect to chargebacks and that determination is made as to who pays the charges and fees. This implies that involving the merchant that fees are not accessed for all disputed transactions. The examiner maintains the rejections.

In response to arguments (6) through (8) see response above. The rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. **Claims 1-2, 6-11, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,154,729 to Cannon (Cannon) in view of US Patent Publication 200210099649 by Lee (Lee) and further in view of US Patent No. 7,356,516 B2 Richey et al (Richey).**

In reference to Claim 1:

Cannon teaches:

(Currently Amended) A method for processing credit transactions, comprising:
identifying by a computer-based system, ...a merchant with a disputed credit transaction
in a period of time, wherein a predetermined threshold ratio of disputed credit
transactions to total credit transactions is stored for the period of time; (see Col 3, lines
45-65, note that merchants with 'excessive' chargebacks are listed on the report);
determining by the computer-based system a number of the disputed credit transactions
and a number of credit transactions involving the merchant in the period of time (see
Col 3, lines 45-65, note that the ratio calculated for the purposes of the report is that of
chargebacks to transactions); determining by the computer- based system, a ratio of the
number of disputed credit transactions to the number of credit transactions for the
merchant (see Col 3, lines 45-65, note that the ratio calculated for the purposes of the
report is that of chargebacks to transactions);

Cannon suggest but does not explicitly teach:

...assessing by the computer-based system, a fee against the merchant for each
disputed transaction involving the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold
ratio, in response to the merchant's ratio being at least equal to the predetermined
threshold ratio...; and wherein the fee is set based on a monetary value of each of the
disputed credit transactions of the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold
ratio((Cannon) in at least Col 3 lines 28-67, Col 4 lines 1-16, 43-55, Col 7 lines 48-67,
Col 8 lines 29-39, 45-49; note that the prior art teaches credit exceed credit risk for
chargebacks and explicitly teaches information provides chargebacks as a percentage

of sales which fairly suggest that the merchants sales exception report incorporates merchant exceeding merchant's ratio)

Cannon does not explicitly teach:

...wherein the fee is not assessed to all disputed transactions...

Lee teaches:

... for assessing a fee ((Lee) para 0019),... assessing by the computer-based system, a fee against the merchant for each disputed transaction ((Lee) para 0019 line 1) involving the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio ((Lee) para 0019), in response to the merchant's ratio being at least equal to the predetermined threshold ratio (see par 19, note that both a fee per chargeback and a fine for too many chargebacks (i.e. typically 1.5-3% of volume) are both taught. The combination of these methods of penalizing chargebacks fairly suggests charging a fee for each transaction that exceeds a threshold in so far as the fee per charge back suggests the 'for each' component and the fine for having too many suggests applying the fee above a threshold) ;...

Richey teaches:

...for assessing a fee ((Richey) in at least Col 5 lines 28-33, Col 16 lines 50-58, Col 18 lines 54-59, Col 21 lines 60-67, Col 22 lines 28-41) ,... ...wherein the fee is not assessed to all disputed transactions,((Richey) in at least FIG. 7; Col 6 lines 45-67, Col 7 lines 1-8, Col 10 lines 34-49, Col 16 lines 40-Col 7 lines 10, Col 21 lines 55-67, Col 22

lines 25-44), wherein the fee is set based on monetary value of each of the disputed credit transactions of the merchant.((Richey) in at least FIG. 5, FIG. 7; Col 5 lines 38-33, Col 6 lines 39-55, Col 7 lines 4-5, 30-40, Col 10 lines 35-50, Col 16 lines 50-58, Col 18 lines 55-59, Col 21 lines 60-67, Col 22 lines 28-44)...

Both Cannon and Lee are directed toward management of transactions. Lee teaches the motivation of providing an incentive for merchants to reduce chargebacks in order to reduce cost and risk. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have provided Cannon with the fee and fine features of Lee in order to have provided merchants with an incentive to take action to reduce chargebacks as taught implicitly by Lee since fines escalate if chargebacks continue unabated.

The combination and Richey are explicitly directed toward transaction disputes. Richey teaches itemizing information with respect to a dispute in order to determine the legitimacy of the disputed transaction (see in at least Col 5 lines 5-10). The prior art provides some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify (applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results) the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. See MPEP § 214 3

In reference to Claim 2:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), wherein the period of time comprises thirty days (see Cannon Col 3, lines 35-45 and Col 4, lines 43-57, note the teaching of a monthly reporting cycle).

In reference to Claim 6:

The combination teaches:

(Currently amended) The method of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), further comprising: establishing, by the computer based system, the predetermined threshold ratio based on a factor comprising an average transaction volume of the merchant (See Cannon Col 3, lines 45-55 and Col 4, lines 43- 57, note that ratio relates chargebacks to transactions. As such, it is fairly suggested that establishment of the ratio is based upon the transaction volume of the merchant since the volume is the factor by which the standard for 'excessive' is defined) (see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 7:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), further comprising: determining, by the computer based system, a number of time periods in which the ratio of the number of disputed credit transactions to the number of credit transactions for the merchant is at least equal to the predetermined threshold value (see Lee par 19- 21), wherein a threshold number of time periods is stored in

which the ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions may exceed the predetermined threshold ratio (see Lee in at least para 0019; note that Lee teaches the after months of escalating fines, the merchant may lose the privilege of receiving payment through credit card issuers. As such, this fairly teaches a second threshold based upon the length of time the merchant exceeds the predetermined threshold. Note further that a second threshold based on time is also an obvious duplication of the threshold taught by Cannon above, particularly in view of the time based penalty of Lee); and further assessing, by the computer-based system, the chargeback fee against the merchant only for each disputed transaction that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio, in response to the ratio being at least equal to the predetermined threshold ratio for the period of time and the number of time periods for the merchant is at least equal to the threshold number of time periods (see Lee para 19, note that penalizing a merchant with fines is known and when combined with the period of time measure taught by Lee fairly suggests charging a fine based upon the number of time periods the merchant exceeds the threshold).

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 8:

The combination teaches:

(Original) The method of claim 7 (see rejection of claim 7 above), wherein the threshold number of time periods is greater than one (see Lee par 21, note that the second threshold of Lee is reached after 'months' of escalating fines).

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 9:

The combination teaches:

(Currently amended) The method of claim 8 (see rejection of claim 8 above), further comprising, before the assessing: generating, by the computer-based system, a notice for transmission to the merchant in response to the number of time periods for the merchant is greater than zero and less than the threshold number of time periods, the notice including: the ratio of the number of disputed credit transactions to the number of credit transactions for the merchant, the predetermined threshold ratio, the number of time periods for the merchant and the threshold number of time periods (see Lee par 19-21, note that before implementing the time based penalty, the merchant was levied a series of fines, fairly suggesting the generation and transmission of a notice.

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 10:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 9 (see rejection of claim 9 above), further comprising: transmitting, by the computer-based system, the notice to the merchant (see Lee par 19-21, note that before implementing the time based penalty, the merchant was levied a series of fines, fairly suggesting the generation and transmission of a notice to the merchant). (see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 11:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 8 (see rejection of claim 8 above), further comprising: generating, by the computer-based system a notice for transmission to the merchant when the number of time periods for the merchant being greater than zero and less than the threshold number of time periods, the notice including at least proposed business solution for reducing the number of disputed credit transactions involving the merchant (see Lee par 19-21, note that before implementing the time based penalty, the merchant was levied a series of fines, fairly suggesting the generation and transmission of a notice. Note that the contents of the claimed notice have been considered, but are non-functional descriptive material in so far as the notice could contain any material and the claimed invention would still operate the same. As such, the contents of the notice have not been given patentable weight so as to distinguish Applicant's claimed invention from the prior art). (see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 13:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 7 (see rejection of clam 7 above), wherein the threshold number of time periods comprising comprises a threshold number of consecutive time periods (see Lee par 21, note that the second threshold of Lee is reached after 'months' of escalating fines).

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 21:

The combination teaches:

(Previously presented) The method of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), wherein the predetermined threshold ratio is lower for higher value transactions ((Lee) para 0127; wherein Le teaches selecting profiles such that profiles are associated measures above certain thresholds, para 0343 wherein the prior art teaches "different rules" with lower threshold score; suggesting variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art)

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

7. Claims 3-5, 12, 14, 16-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Cannon in view of US Patent Applicant Publication 2002/0099649 by Lee and US Patent No. 7,356,516 B2 Richey et al (Richey), as applied to claim 1 above with respect to claims 3-5; as applied to claims 1 and 7 above with respect to claim 12; and in further view of US Patent Application Publication 2004/0030644 to Sharper (Sharper).

In reference to Claim 3:

The combination teaches:

(Currently amended) The method of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above)...

The combination does not explicitly teach:

...wherein the predetermined threshold ratio comprises three percent.

Sharper teaches:

...wherein the predetermined threshold ratio comprises three percent (see para 10, note that a limit may be set at 1-3%) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have provided Cannon in view of Lee with the particular threshold level taught by Sharper in order to have limited the percentage of chargebacks allowed to merchants as taught explicitly by Sharper (see para 10).

In reference to Claim 4:

The combination suggest/teaches:

(Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), further comprising: establishing, by the computer-based system, the predetermined threshold ratio based on a factor comprising: an industry category including the merchant. ((Lee) para 0346)

Sharper teaches:

...establishing the predetermined threshold ratio based on a factor comprising an industry category including the merchant (see par 11, note that chargeback characteristics vary from industry to industry. A ratio based on industry category is thus fairly suggested to accommodate the differences between industries). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have provided Cannon in view of Lee with that industry differentiation of Sharper in order to have matched the risk of an industry with the level of fine as taught implicitly by Sharper since Sharper teaches the incidence of chargebacks varies across industries.

In reference to Claim 5:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 4 (see rejection of claim 4 above), wherein the industry category comprising comprises a standard industrial classification code (see Lee para 101, note that the transaction summary variables include SIC codes, thus fairly suggesting their use in identifying the industry of the transaction). (see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 4 above)

In reference to Claim 12:

The combination teaches:

(Original) The method of claim 7 (see rejection of claim 7 above), wherein the threshold number of time periods is based on an industry category including the merchant (see par 11, note that chargeback characteristics vary from industry to industry. A ratio based on industry category is thus fairly suggested to accommodate the differences between industries).

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 4 above)

In reference to Claim 14:

Cannon teaches:

(Currently Amended) A method comprising: calculating, by a computer-based system, for assessing a fee, a ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions (see Cannon, Col 3, lines 45-55, note that the ratio calculated for the purposes of the report is that of chargebacks to transactions) for each of a plurality of industry categories for a previous period of time (see Sharper, para 11, note that

chargeback characteristics vary from industry to industry. A ratio based on industry category is thus fairly suggested to accommodate the differences between industries); determining, by: the computer-based system a first threshold ratio for a first of the industry categories based on a first factor comprising said calculating (see Cannon, Col lines 3, lines 45-55 in combination with Sharper para 11, note that a threshold ratio is fairly suggested by the teaching that vendors with 'excessive' chargeback ratios are listed. The suggestion is fairly made by the need for there to be a measure i.e. the predetermined threshold ratio for determining what is 'excessive', note further the industry discussion of Sharper above; see in at least para 0019; note that multiple parameters may utilized to increase security and control behavior) determining by: the computer-based system, second threshold ratio, lower than the first threshold ratio, for a second of the industry categories based on the first factor, the second of the industry categories having a lower ratio of disputed credit transaction to total credit transactions in the previous period of time than the first of the industry categories (see Cannon, Col 3, lines 4,5-55 in combination with Sharper par 11, note that a plurality of threshold ratios is fairly suggested by the combination of these teachings since Sharper teaches that chargeback characteristics vary from industry to industry) determining a ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions for a merchant ((Cannon) Col 3 lines 4,5-65) in the first of the industry categories ((Lee) para 0019, para 0346; wherein banks levy fines for merchants having two many chargeback and further teaches product, customer, business and merchant are risk determinants; ((Sharper) para 0011; wherein chargeback vary from industry to industry which would make obvious that ratio

would be relevant to industry); and assessing, by the computer-based system, a fee in response to the ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions is at least equal to the first threshold ratio ((Lee) para 0019; ((Richey) in at least FIG. 5, FIG. 7; Col 5 lines 38-33, Col 6 lines 39-55, Col 7 lines 4-5, 30-40, Col 10 lines 35-50, Col 16 lines 50-58, Col 18 lines 55-59, Col 21 lines 60-67, Col 22 lines 28-44) wherein the fee is not assessed to all disputed transactions ((Richey) in at least FIG. 7; Col 6 lines 45-67, Col 7 lines 1-8, Col 10 lines 34-49, Col 16 lines 40-Col 7 lines 10, Col 21 lines 55-67, Col 22 lines 25-44); and wherein the fee set based on a monetary value of each of the disputed credit transactions of the merchant that exceeds the second threshold ratio ((Cannon) in at least Col 7 lines 48-67, Col 8 lines 29-39, 45-49; (Richey) in at least FIG. 5, FIG. 7; Col 5 lines 38-33, Col 6 lines 39-55, Col 7 lines 4-5, 30-40, Col 10 lines 35-50, Col 16 lines 50-58, Col 18 lines 55-59, Col 21 lines 60-67, Col 22 lines 28-44; Richey teaches itemizing information with respect to a dispute in order to determine the legitimacy of the disputed transaction (see in at least Col 5 lines 5-10). (See rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claims 1 and 4 above).

In reference to Claim 16:

The combination teaches:

(Previously presented) The method of claim 14 (see rejection of claim 14 above), wherein the fee is assessed for each disputed credit transaction that exceeds the first threshold ratio (see Lee par 19, note that both a fee per chargeback and a fine for too many chargebacks are both taught. The combination of these methods of penalizing

chargebacks fairly suggests charging a fee for each transaction that exceeds a threshold in so far as the fee per charge back suggests the 'for each' component and the fine for having too many suggests applying the fee above a threshold). (see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claims 1 and 4 above).

In reference to Claim 17:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 14 (see rejection of claim 14 above), further comprising determining a first threshold number of time periods in which the ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions for a merchant in the first of the industry categories exceeds the first threshold ratio, based on said calculating (see Lee par 19-21, note that Lee teaches the after months of escalating fines, the merchant may lose the privilege of receiving payment through credit card issuers. As such, this fairly teaches a second threshold based upon the length of time the merchant exceeds the predetermined threshold. Note further that a second threshold based on time is also an obvious duplication of the threshold taught by Cannon above, particularly in view of the time based penalty of Lee, see also Sharper par 11); and determining a second threshold number of time periods, lower than the first threshold number of time periods, in which the ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions for a merchant in the second of the industry categories may exceed the second threshold ratio, based on said calculating (see Lee par 19-21 and Sharper par 11).
(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claims 1 and 4 above)

In reference to Claim 18:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 17 (See rejection of claim 17 above), further comprising: determining, by the computer-based system, a ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions for the merchant for a plurality of previous time periods (see Cannon Col 3, lines 45-55, note that the ratio calculated for the purposes of the report is that of chargebacks to transactions and Lee para 18-21); determining, by the computer-based system, a number of time periods in which the ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions of the merchant is greater than the first threshold ratio (see Cannon Col 3, lines 45-55, note that the ratio calculated for the purposes of the report is that of chargebacks to transactions and Lee par 18-21); and assessing, by the computer-based system, a fee in response to the merchant's current ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions is at least equal to the first threshold ratio and the number of time periods for the merchant is at least equal to the first threshold number of time periods (see Lee see Lee par 19 in combination with 21, note that penalizing a merchant with fines is known and when combined with the period of time measure taught by Lee fairly suggests charging a fine based upon the number of time periods the merchant exceeds the threshold) (see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claims 1 and 4 above)

In reference to Claim 19:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The method of claim 18 (see rejection of claim 18 above), further comprising: generating a notice for transmission to the merchant in response to the merchant's current ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions is at least equal to the first threshold ratio and the number of time periods for the merchant less than the first threshold number of time periods, including a predetermined period of time in which the merchant must lower their ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions to avoid chargeback fees (see Lee par 19-21, note that before implementing the time based penalty, the merchant was levied a series of fines, fairly suggesting the generation and transmission of a notice. Note that the contents of the claimed notice have been considered, but are non-functional descriptive material in so far as the notice could contain any material and the claimed invention would still operate the same. As such, the contents of the notice have not been given patentable weight so as to distinguish Applicant's claimed invention from the prior art).

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claims 1 and 4 above)

In reference to Claim 20:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) A non-transitory computer-readable medium having stored thereon sequences of instruction, the sequences of instruction including instruction which, if executed by a computer-based system, causes the computer-based system to perform operations comprising: determine, by the computer-based system, an average ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions (see Cannon, Col 3, lines

Art Unit: 3694

45-55, note that the ratio calculated for the purposes of the report is that of chargebacks to transactions) for each of a plurality of industry categories (see Sharper, par 11, note that chargeback characteristics vary from industry to industry. A ratio based on industry category is thus fairly suggested to accommodate the differences between industries); generate, by the computer-based system, a threshold ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions ratio for a first of the industry categories based on at least a first factor comprising an automatically determined average ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions (see Cannon, Col 3, lines 45-55 in combination with Sharper para 11, note that a threshold ratio is fairly suggested by the teaching that vendors with 'excessive' chargeback ratios are listed. The suggestion is fairly made by the need for there to be a measure -i.e. the predetermined threshold ratio-for determining what is 'excessive', note further the industry discussion of Sharper above) determine, by the computer-based system, a ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions for a merchant in the first of the industry categories (see Cannon Col 3, lines 45-55, in combination with Sharper par 11); and assess, by the computer- based system, a fee to the merchant in response to in response to the merchant's ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions is greater than the threshold ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions, the fee applied to each disputed transaction involving the merchant that causes the merchant to exceed the threshold ratio of disputed credit transactions to total credit transactions (Lee see para 19, note that both a fee per chargeback and a fine for too many chargebacks are both taught. The combination of these methods of penalizing

chargebacks fairly suggests charging a fee for each transaction that exceeds a threshold in so far as the fee per charge back suggests the 'for each' component and the fine for having too many suggests applying the fee above a threshold), wherein the fee is not assessed to all disputed transactions, ,((Richey) in at least FIG. 7; Col 6 lines 45-67, Col 7 lines 1-8, Col 10 lines 34-49, Col 16 lines 40-Col 7 lines 10, Col 21 lines 55-67, Col 22 lines 25-44), and wherein the fee is set based on a monetary value of each of the disputed credit transactions of the merchant that exceeds the predetermined threshold ratio ((Cannon) in at least Col 3 lines 28-67, Col 4 lines 1-16, 43-55, Col 7 lines 48-67, Col 8 lines 29-39, 45-49; note that the prior art teaches credit exceed credit risk for chargebacks and explicitly teaches information provides chargebacks as a percentage of sales which fairly suggest that the merchants sales exception report incorporates merchant exceeding merchant's ratio; (Lee) see para 0019, note that both a fee per chargeback and a fine for too many chargebacks (i.e. typically 1.5-3% of volume) are both taught. The combination of these methods of penalizing chargebacks fairly suggests charging a fee for each transaction that exceeds a threshold in so far as the fee per charge back suggests the 'for each' component and the fine for having too many suggests applying the fee above a threshold)

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claims 1 and 4 above).

In reference to Claim 22:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The method of claim 14 (see rejection of claim 14 above), wherein the threshold ratios are lower for higher value transactions ((Lee) para 0127; wherein Lee teaches selecting profiles such that profiles are associated measures above certain thresholds, para 0343 wherein the prior art teaches "different rules" with lower threshold score; suggesting variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art)

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 23:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The medium of claim 20 (see rejection of claim 20 above), wherein the threshold ratio is lower for higher value transactions ((Lee) para 0127; wherein Le teaches selecting profiles such that profiles are associated measures above certain thresholds, para 0343 wherein the prior art teaches "different rules" with lower threshold score; suggesting variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art)

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARY GREGG whose telephone number is (571)270-5050. The examiner can normally be reached on 4/10.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 5712726712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shahid R Merchant/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3694

/M. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 3694